REMARKS

The application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated August 30, 2006. Claims 1-11 were pending. By this Amendment, new claims 12 and 13 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-3 and 5-10 are now pending, with claims 1, 5-7, 10 and 12 being in independent form.

The Office Action indicates that claims 4 and 11 have been allowed. New claims 12 and 13 are believed to be similarly allowable.

Claims 1-3 and 5-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as purportedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,137,597 to Kanaya.

Applicant has carefully considered the Examiner's comments and the cited art, and respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 5-7 and 10 are patentable over the cited art, for at least the following reasons.

This application relates to improvements made by Applicant to facsimile communications by a receiving (or called) facsimile apparatus with the capability of using optional frames. Identification information of a calling facsimile machine is included in the call received from the calling machine, and the receiving facsimile machine compares the identification information identifying the calling facsimile machine with prestored identification information for the different machines which adopt the common specification of optional frames. If the calling machine identification information corresponds to the prestored identification information, facsimile communications operation using the optional frame is performed by the receiving facsimile machine. On the other hand, if the calling machine identification information does not indicate (for example, match the prestored identification information) that the calling machine adopts a common specification of optional frames, optional frames are not used and instead

standard facsimile operations that do not use the optional frame are performed by the receiving facsimile machine for facsimile communications with the calling facsimile machine. Each of independent claims 1, 5-7 and 10 addresses these features, as well as additional features.

Kanaya, as understood by Applicant, proposes a network facsimile approach for more securely delivering image information received over a publicly switched network to the destined recipient via a local area network and avoiding delivery of the received information to an unintended recipient.

As previously discussed of record, Kanaya proposes that the transmitted information include a sub-address and password information of a **destination user**.

Kanaya, column 6, lines 30-38, which is cited in the Office Action, states as follows:

> The network facsimile FX may alternatively utilize a Transmitting Subscriber Identification TSI signal according to the facsimile transmission procedure for informing the receiving terminal of the sub-address and password information **of the destination terminal**. The TSI signal **normally** includes the telephone number of the transmitting facsimile apparatus and an identification of the facility where the apparatus is located such as, for example, a company name or the like.
>
> FIG. 4a shows a typical TSI data field. As shown in the drawing, a TSI data field 20 may be a 20-character long data field including a sub-field 21 for a telephone number and a sub-field 22 for facility identification.
>
> FIG. 4b shows an example of a TSI data field including a sub-address and password information. The TSI data field 20 is **modified** to include a new sub-field 24 which carries a character string representing the sub-address and password information of **a destination user**. In the example, a first four-character string represents the sub-address and a second four-character string represents the password information of the destination user. This field is commenced with a sub-field 23 for a unique control character, such as the asterisk mark (*) or the pound sign (#), which allows the receiving terminal to recognize the end of the telephone number and the start of the sub-address and the password information of the destination user.

Thus, Kanaya acknowledges that the TSI signal is normally used for identification of the calling facility, but proposes that the TSI signal be modified to include, in place of the identification of the calling facility, the sub-address and password information of the destination terminal, in furtherance of the objective of Kanaya which is to ensure that the transmission is not

delivered to an unintended recipient. Identification in the TSI signal of the calling machine simply does not achieve that such objective.

Although Kanaya proposes comparing subaddress and password information to an address conversion table, the subaddress and password information being compared to address conversion table information represents the subaddress and password of the destination terminal (that is, corresponding to Fig. 4b of Kanaya).

Kanaya simply does not teach or suggest a facsimile communication method for performing a Group 3 facsimile communications operation using an optional frame signal, which includes (a) receiving a call from a calling facsimile machine for a facsimile communications operation using an optional frame and identification information of the calling facsimile machine, (b) comparing the identification information of the calling facsimile machine with the identification information prestored in the memory, (c) canceling performance of the facsimile communications operation using the optional frame and executing standard facsimile operations that do not use the optional frame, when the identification information of the calling facsimile machine does not correspond with the identification information prestored in the memory, and (d) executing the facsimile communications operation using the optional frame when the identification information of the calling facsimile machine corresponds to the identification information prestored in the memory, as provided by the subject matter of claim 1.

Independent claims 5-7 and 10 are patentably distinct from the cited art for at least similar reasons.

Accordingly, for at least the above-stated reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 5-7 and 10 and the claims depending therefrom are patentable over the cited art.

The Office Action indicates that claims 4 and 11 are allowed.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance in the Office Action and submits that the allowed claims recite subject matter which further supports patentability for reasons in addition to those identified in the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance in the Office Action.

In view of the remarks hereinabove, Applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance, and earnestly solicits the allowance of the application.

If a petition for an extension of time is required to make this response timely, this paper should be considered to be such a petition. The Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required in connection with this amendment and to credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

If a telephone interview could advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Teng, Reg. No. 40,837
Attorney for Applicant
Cooper & Dunham LLP
Tel.: (212) 278-0400